

REMARKS

The present application was filed on May 24, 2001 with claims 1 through 32. Claims 1 through 32 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. The present amendment proposes to amend independent claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24 and 28
 5 and cancel claim 13, without prejudice.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10-12, 15, 16, 18-22, 24, 25, and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baker et al. (United States Patent Number 5,680,511), and rejected claims 3, 7-9, 14, 17, 23, 26, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. in view of Mitchell et
 10 al. (United States Patent Number 5,799,273). The Examiner indicated that claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

This amendment is submitted pursuant to 37 CFR §1.116 and should be entered. The Amendment places all of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-32, in a form
 15 that is believed allowable, and, in any event, in a better form for appeal. It is believed that examination of the pending claims as amended, which are consistent with the previous record herein, will not place any substantial burden on the Examiner. The present amendment merely introduces all of the limitations of claim 13, which the Examiner has indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all
 20 of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims, into each independent claim.

Independent Claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24 and 28

Independent claim 1, 5, 15, 19, 24, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baker et al. Regarding claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24, and 28,
 25 the Examiner asserts that Baker teaches “processing....salient terms” as picking out unrecognized words (col. 9, lines 4-9); and “displaying the text....terms” as displaying the choice words to be analyzed (col. 10, lines 27-30).

Applicants have amended each of the independent claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24 and 28 to include all of the limitations of claim 13, which the Examiner has indicated
 30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-14, 16-18, 20-23, 25-27 and 29-32

5 Dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 10-12, 16, 18, 20-22, 25, 27, and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baker et al., and claims 3, 7-9, 14, 17, 23, 26, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. in view of Mitchell et al.

10 Claims 2-4, 6-14, 16-18, 20-23, 25-27 and 29-32 are dependent on claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24, and 28, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Baker et al. and Mitchell et al. (alone or in combination) because of their dependency from independent claims 1, 5, 15, 19, 24, and 28 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-32, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

15 If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

20

Respectfully submitted,



Date: August 10, 2005

25

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560